

view of Bennett. For the following two reasons, however, applicant believes that these claims are not obvious even if these two references are considered in combination.

Firstly, neither of the cited references relates to a continuously operating kind of bag-making packaging machine. In Paragraph 2 of the Official Letter, the Examiner cites Bennett as teaching that it is known to either print on a moving web or intermittently print when the film is stopped, but there is no disclosure as to how a continuous mode is effected. Mere knowledge (or information) that it is known to do in a continuously operating mode does not help a person even skilled in the art to come up with the concept of the present invention. It is believed that the least that the Examiner could have done is to cite a reference actually disclosing a packaging machine which operates continuously to carry out the printing, as limited in claim 1 of the present application.

Secondly, neither of the cited references discloses any memory that stores correlation data of the kind shown in Fig. 3C between print data and packaging conditions. Prior art technologies taught inputting packaging conditions (such as bag length) and print data (such as font and character size) but not any data that correlate them. As a result, if the user of a prior art packaging machine combined with a printer wished to change the packaging condition, for example, the printing data also had to be newly inputted. According to the present invention, the user in such a situation is required only to specify the new packaging condition because the packaging machine automatically responds by selecting the preliminarily inputted printing data corresponding to the newly selected packaging condition. This has the merit of not only simplifying the operation on the part of the user but also reducing the possibility of committing an input error. Correlation data of this type capable of simplifying the user's operation and reducing the possibility of input error are not disclosed or even hinted at by either of the cited references.


The Examiner points to Bennett's control unit 45, allegedly acting as a "processing mechanism" (line 2 in page 3 of the Official Letter), but this control unit 45 is a "printing control unit 45" (column 7 at line 35). Although Bennett shows a "counter mark sensor 42" in Fig. 7, what is referred to as the counter mark sensor is actually an eye mark sensor (column 7, lines 29-33). Bennett's control unit 45 serves only to receive detection signals for detecting eye marks on the film and to output signals to the printer and to the stopper for

stopping the printer but it does NOT control the package-making operation of the packaging machine. In other words, Bennett is not teaching or even hinting at controlling the printing and bag-making operations in a correlated manner.

No prior art packaging machine is believed to have been operated in such a correlated manner, much less with such correlation data stored thereby. This is probably bag-making machines and printers are conventionally produced by different makers and hence are made to be independently controlled.

In summary, the concept of controlling the bag-making operations and the printing operations in a correlated manner and that of providing and storing correlation data for such a purpose are believed to be novel. Applicant is therefore in the belief that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Keiichi Nishimura
Registration No. 29,093

February 20, 2003
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP
P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
Telephone: (510) 843-6200
Telefax: (510) 843-6203